

Legal

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

OGC 7-0265

Document No. 188
No Change in Class. <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Declassified
Class. Changed to: TS S E 1989
Next Review Date: _____
Auth.: HR 70-3
Date: 16 JAN 1979 By: _____

DD/S

57-0606

19 February 1957

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

OGC HAS REVIEWED.

25X1A9A SUBJECT: _____

25X1A

25X1A9A

1. On 19 February 1957 _____ and I met with Mr. Samuel Intrater, who appeared for his client, _____

25X1A9A

25X1A9A

Specifically, _____ had complained that in forcing the door of his apartment on 1 June 1956 his rights of privacy had been invaded and he wanted Mr. Intrater to take action against the Agency.

2. I recounted to Mr. Intrater the facts leading up to the forced entry, our worries about _____ state of health and despondency, the fact that various attempts had been made to get in touch with him and to get him to answer the door, that the passkey had been tried but the bolt prevented entry by that means, and that finally the police had called the landlord and obtained permission to use force if necessary if the key did not work again. It was, therefore, the police who finally effected the entry and found _____ within the room. I said that the action had been taken out of concern for _____ interest.

25X1A9A

25X1A9A

25X1A9A

3. Mr. Intrater said that he still thought his client's privacy had been invaded by the Agency. I pointed out that it had been the police who made the entry, and Mr. Intrater claimed that if the police acted under our direction we would be equally liable if any liability existed. I mentioned that we had no means of directing the police and that in any case we had asked him in to try and acquaint him with the true facts of the matter and I was not interested in arguing the law. I said I thought we had acted in his client's best interest and that there would be little

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

sympathy for any claim for damages under these circumstances but that if he wished to file a claim he could do so and it would be administratively denied. Mr. [] also pointed out that it was the aim of the Personnel Office to help the employee out under these circumstances. Mr. Intrater said there seemed to be no further purpose in discussing the matter, with which I agreed.

25X1A

S/

LAWRENCE R. HOUSTON
General Counsel

✓DD/S

cc: IG

Asst to DCI (Grogan)
Director of Personnel
Director of Security

CONFIDENTIAL